

**NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION**

No. 15-6293

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**  
Jun 17, 2016  
DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

GLORIA S. JACKSON,  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CITY OF MEMPHIS, TN,  
Defendant-Appellee.

)  
)  
)  
)  
) ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED  
) STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
) THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF  
) TENNESSEE  
)  
)  
)

**ORDER**

Before: GUY and McKEAGUE, Circuit Judges; BERTELSMAN, District Judge.\*

Gloria S. Jackson, a Mississippi resident proceeding pro se, appeals the district court's judgment dismissing her employment discrimination complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e–2000e-17. This case has been referred to a panel of the court that, upon examination, unanimously agrees that oral argument is not needed. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a).

In May 2015, Jackson sued the City of Memphis, Tennessee (City) under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Jackson alleges that she was employed by the City from 1986 to 1989, that the City discriminated against her in 1987, that she filed charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) as a result, and that the City has continued to retaliate against her by reporting “damaging” information to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), which has

---

\*The Honorable William O. Bertelsman, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky, sitting by designation.

No. 15-6293

- 2 -

been revealed to prospective employers during criminal background investigations and has prevented her from getting a job. Jackson further alleges that she learned about the FBI criminal background report in 2010 and filed her “original charge then.” Jackson states that she received a right to sue letter from the EEOC in December 2010.

A magistrate judge screened Jackson’s complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and recommended dismissing her complaint because it was time-barred and precluded by the doctrine of res judicata. The district court overruled Jackson’s objections, concluding that she had not filed any specific objections to the report and recommendation as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). The district court adopted the report and recommendation and dismissed Jackson’s complaint.

Jackson appeals. Although she does not articulate a clear appellate argument, Jackson appears to be asking this court to reinstate her case and allow her to submit a copy of a September 2010 right to sue letter issued by the EEOC.

We review de novo a district court’s dismissal of a complaint under § 1915(e)(2). *See Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470 (6th Cir. 2010). We construe the “complaint in the light most favorable to” Jackson and “accept all well-pleaded factual allegations as true.” *Ashland, Inc. v. Oppenheimer & Co.*, 648 F.3d 461, 467 (6th Cir. 2011) (quoting *La. Sch. Emps.’ Ret. Sys. v. Ernst & Young, LLP*, 622 F.3d 471, 477–78 (6th Cir. 2010)). Factual allegations need not be set forth in great detail, but they must “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007).

Jackson forfeited any challenge to the report and recommendation by failing to file specific objections. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *Kensu v. Haigh*, 87 F.3d 172, 176 (6th Cir. 1996); *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 155 (1985). The magistrate judge cited Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2), advised Jackson that she had fourteen days to file specific objections, and warned her that a failure to do so may constitute a waiver of appeal. In her objections, Jackson did not present any arguments that challenged any specific portions of the report and recommendation. Consequently, Jackson forfeited her right to appeal. *See Wilson v. McMacken*, 786 F.2d 216, 220 (6th Cir. 1986).

No. 15-6293

- 3 -

While we may review Jackson's claims in the interests of justice, *see Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 155, she does not explain her failure to file specific objections or provide any reasoned challenge to the dismissal of her case.

Accordingly, we **AFFIRM** the district court's judgment.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Deborah S. Hunt", is written over a horizontal line.

Deborah S. Hunt, Clerk

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

Deborah S. Hunt  
Clerk

100 EAST FIFTH STREET, ROOM 540  
POTTER STEWART U.S. COURTHOUSE  
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-3988

Tel. (513) 564-7000  
[www.ca6.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca6.uscourts.gov)

Filed: June 17, 2016

Ms. Gloria S. Jackson  
1589 Lyles Road  
Senatobia, MS 38668

Re: Case No. 15-6293, *Gloria Jackson v. City of Memphis, TN*  
Originating Case No. : 2:15-cv-02313

Dear Ms. Jackson:

The Court issued the enclosed Order today in this case.

Sincerely yours,

s/Leon T. Korotko  
Case Manager  
Direct Dial No. 513-564-7014

cc: Mr. Thomas M. Gould

Enclosure

Mandate to issue